

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending, however claims 24-26 are deemed withdrawn, the restriction requirement having been made final. Applicants are canceling these claims herein, but reserve the right to continue prosecution of the canceled subject matter in a later-filed application. Claims 1-23 and 27 have been examined and stand rejected.

The Office has required Applicants to submit an abstract of the disclosure on a separate sheet. Applicants attach an abstract to this response and request that it be entered into the application. No new matter is added.

The Office also objects to the disclosure as lacking a "brief description of the drawings" and for referring to claims 41-43. The specification is being amended herein to correct these formalities. Support for the material added to page 7 of the specification may be found throughout the specification and at page 32, lines 25-28; page 36, lines 19-21; page 38, lines 4-7, 19-21 and 34-37; page 39, lines 9-12 and 29-34, page 40, lines 30-35; page 42, lines 12-30 and page 43, lines 10-13 and 22-25. Applicants request the objections to the specification be withdrawn in light of these amendments.

The Office has objected to claims 4-23 as being in improper multiple dependent form. Applicants have amended the claims to correct the multiple dependency and request that the Office withdraw this objection.

Claims 1-23 and 27 are rejected as indefinite under the standards of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended to change or avoid the terminology specifically mentioned and to place the claims in an American-style format. Claim 12 is canceled. Applicants request withdrawal of this

rejection. Applicants also have added new claims dependent on claim 1 and claim 27. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-23 and 27 are rejected as anticipated by Quate et al. The Quate patent is cited for teaching direct write optical lithography for synthesizing a polymer array without a mask. Applicants traverse this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 to be proper, the cited reference must contain, within its four corners, each and every limitation of the claims. M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Claim 1 is limited to methods in which photoactivatable groups are activated by "monitored and controlled location-specific illumination ... to generate an adjustable illumination pattern which is controlled by means of a light sensor matrix." The Office may refer to page 17, lines 35-38 for support for these claim limitations in the specification.

Applicants submit that the cited reference, Quate et al., nowhere discloses or even suggests either monitoring or control by means of a light sensor matrix. The Office may note that the claim term "where appropriate," mentioned in the Office Action at page 6, lines 4-5, has been deleted from the claim, thereby removing the stated concern with respect to this feature. Claim 1 therefore requires control by means of a light sensor matrix. Quate et al. do not discuss or even hint at such an element in their disclosed system and the Office has not pointed to any such disclosure. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejection is improper with respect to claim 1, all claims dependent on claim 1 and new claim 56, which contains these same limitations.

With respect to claim 27, Applicants also traverse this rejection. Claim 27 recites "a UV source selected from the group

consisting of a diode array, a UV laser array and both a diode array and a UV laser array." Although the Quate et al. patent mentions the potential of an LED (diode) array or a semiconductor laser array as a light source to replace the spatial light moderator, the priority document, U.S. Provisional Serial No. 60/087,333, does not disclose, mention or even suggest this claim limitation. The cited reference therefore is not entitled to its priority date with respect to its disclosure of an LED (diode) or laser array. The effective filing date for Quate et al. in this respect therefore is no earlier than May 26, 1999, which is not prior to the earliest priority date claimed by the present application. Applicants submit that the Quate et al. patent is not prior art against claim 27 and therefore that this rejection should be withdrawn. Applicants therefore request that the Office withdraw the rejection of all claims over Quate et al.


Claims 1-23 and 27 are rejected as anticipated by Cerrina et al. As for Quate et al., this reference does not disclose or suggest any monitoring or light sensor component, which is required by claim 1 and new claim 56. Applicants submit that this rejection is improper for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Quate et al. Moreover, Cerrina et al. does not disclose or even suggest using a diode or UV laser array in producing their DNA probe arrays. The rejection therefore is improper with respect to claim 27 (and new claim 56) as well. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-23 and 27 are provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-36 of co-pending application Serial No. 09/763,914 and over claims 1-38 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/727,566. Applicants would like to express their willingness to file an appropriate

terminal disclaimer over any conflicting claims should any of these claims be granted. Applicants also would like to make the Office aware of co-pending application Serial No. 10/399,450 which was cited in the prosecution of Serial No. 09/763,914.

Applicants request withdrawal of all pending rejections and favorable consideration of the claims at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Number or Bar Code Label 6449					
Name	Martha Cassidy, Reg. No. 44,066				
Signature				Date	7/21/05
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck p.c. Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031